



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,990	07/11/2005	Handoko Kohar	NL030012US1	7994
24737 7590 01/08/2008 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				
EXAMINER				
KEATON, SHERROD L				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2174				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/08/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/541,990

Applicant(s)

KOHAR ET AL.

Examiner

Sherrod Keaton

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CI/CD)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the original filing of 10-02-2007. Claims 1, 3-10 are pending and have been considered below:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 5, 6, 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kandogan et al ("Kandogan", Elastic Windows) in view of Kuromusha et al ("Kuromusha", US 7028265 B2).

Claim 1: Kandogan discloses a method of rearranging non-overlapping views on a computer screen, the method comprising the steps of:

the computer receiving a rearrangement request from a user to collectively rearrange views on the computer screen relative to an original arrangement of views (Page 34, Column 11, Paragraph 4),

the computer displaying the selected alternative arrangement on the screen with all the views retaining their original dimensions from the original arrangement of views (Page 32, Column 8); (Page 34, Column 11, Paragraph 4),

However Kandogan does not explicitly disclose that the computer is determining one or more possible alternative arrangements of views in response to the rearrangement request and selecting one possible alternative arrangement for display and with each successive rearrangement the computer selecting for display one of another possible arrangement of views or the original arrangement of views. However Kuromusha discloses a window display system and method for a computer system and further discloses the sub-windows being rearranged in reference to the main window and for each view rearrangement relative position is kept therefore providing alternate views (Column 3, Lines 48-58). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a rearrangement of views determined by the computer in Kandogan as taught by Kuromusha. One would have been motivated to provide arrangements to keep a relative position of importance between parent and children views.

Claim 5: Kandogan and Kuromusha disclose a method as in claim 1 above, and further disclose wherein the step of receiving a rearrangement request is carried out by the user activating a software button on the screen (Kandogan: Page 34, Column 11, Paragraph 4).

Claim 6: Kandogan and Kuromusha disclose a method as in claim 1 above, wherein all possible alternative rearrangements of the views are determined as the first rearrangement request is received, these alternative rearrangements being stored and successively displayed whenever a rearrangement request is received (Kandogan; Page 34, Column 12, Paragraph 2).

Claim 8: Claim 8 is similar in scope to Claim 1 and rejected with the same rationale. (Kandogan; Page 36, Column 16, Paragraph 2; Explains applications for window operations performed on devices that are claimed).

Claim 9: Claim 9 is similar in scope to Claim 1 and rejected with the same rationale.

Claim 10: Kandogan and Kuromusha disclose a record carrier, such as a CD-ROM, provided with a software product as claimed in 9. (It is inherent that some form of record carrier or memory component be in place in order to retain the software to perform the method.)

3. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kandogan et al (“Kandogan “ Elastic Windows) and Kuromusha et al (“Kuromusha” US 7028265 B2) as applied to Claim 1 above, and in further view of Zenith (7036083 B1).

Claim 3: Kandogan and Kuromusha disclose a method as claim 1 above, but do not explicitly disclose that in an alternative arrangement, the positions of two views have been swapped relative to the original arrangement of views. However Zenith discloses a multimode interactive television chat and further discloses switching the modes, the modes include switching the z-order which deals with the modes position (Figure 6 and 7; Column 6, Lines 15-59). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow the views to switch in the modified Kandogan as taught by Zenith. One would have been motivated to switch focus because it improves the efficiency of the program by allowing the current screen being used to occupy the majority of the screen.

4. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kandogan et al ("Kandogan " Elastic Windows) and Kuromusha et al ("Kuromusha" US 7028265 B2) as applied to Claim 1 above, and in further view of Ellison-Taylor (5796402).

Claim 4: Kandogan and Kuromusha disclose a method as claim 1 above, but do not explicitly disclose wherein at least one view may be excluded from rearranging. However Ellison-Taylor discloses a method for aligning windows on a computer screen and further disclose an ignore command that excludes window from adjustment (Column 4, Lines 10-13). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have an ignore function in the modified Kandogan as taught by Ellison-Taylor. One would have been motivated to have an ignore button to allow the user to keep certain windows from being adjusted that were already set to an ideal viewing arrangement.

5. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kandogan et al (“Kandogan “ Elastic Windows”) and Kuromusha et al (“Kuromusha” US 7028265 B2) as applied to Claim 1 above, and in further view of Southgate (5561757).

Claim 7: Kandogan and Kuromusha disclose a method as claim in 1 above, but do not explicitly disclose wherein, when all possible alternative arrangements have been displayed, the original arrangement is displayed again, with a message stating that all possible arrangements have been displayed. However Southgate discloses a computer interface having tiled and overlapped window areas and further discloses a status window for displaying information to user (Column 6, Lines 4-14). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a status window to inform user of any valuable information pertinent to the user which could include information about alternative displayed arrangements in the modified Kandogan as taught by Southgate. One would have been motivated to have the status window because it is a simple way to inform a user with help options and also error alerts.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as necessitated by the amendments.

Conclusion

Applicants amendments necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sherrod Keaton whose telephone number is 571) 270-1697. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. and alternating Fri. off (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dave Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3800.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SLK

12-19-07

/David A Wiley/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2174